

**MERRIMACK VILLAGE DISTRICT
BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS
JULY 18, 2022
MEETING MINUTES
(approved August 22, 2022)**

A regular meeting of the Board of Commissioners was conducted on July 18, 2022, at 4:30 p.m. at 2 Greens Pond Road, Merrimack, NH.

Chairman, Donald Provencher presided:

Members of the Board present: Kenneth Ayers, Vice Chairman
 Wolfram von Schoen, Personnel Liaison
 John Lyons

Members of the Board Absent: Paul McLaughlin

Also in Attendance: Ron Miner, Superintendent
 Jill Lavoie, Business Manager
 Michele Holton, Finance Director/HR

NON-PUBLIC SESSION

**MOTION BY COMMISSIONER LYONS THAT THE COMMISSION GO INTO NON-PUBLIC SESSION PURSUANT TO RSA 91-A:3, II(e)
MOTION SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER W. VON SCHOEN**

**MOTION CARRIED
4-0-0**

The Commission went into non-public session at 4:31 p.m.

The Commission came out of non-public session at 5:00 p.m.

REGULAR SESSION

**MOTION BY COMMISSIONER W. VON SCHOEN TO SEAL THE MINUTES OF THE JULY 18, 2022 NON-PUBLIC SESSION
MOTION SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER J. LYONS**

**MOTION CARRIED
4-0-0**

RECESS

**MOTION BY COMMISSIONER W. VON SCHOEN TO RECESS THE REGULAR BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS MEETING TO OPEN THE PUBLIC HEARING
MOTION SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER J. LYONS**

MOTION CARRIED

4-0-0

REGULAR SESSION

At this time, Keith Pratt, of Underwood Engineers, gave a brief recap of the rate increase for fiscal year 2022-2023. He stated that MVD has an 11% rate increase in front of them and noted that the tiered rate structure will go up 11% as well. Pratt stated that the purpose for the 11% is not inconsistent with what was laid out in 2017-2018 when the \$14.5M warrant article was passed for the treatment facilities. At that time, an overall rate increase of 79% was projected. This 11% increase will bring MVD close to those projections, but Underwood expects one more rate increase will be needed. Pratt stated that it is estimated that an additional rate increase of 13% will be necessary. According to Pratt, this will be reassessed next year.

1. Board of Commissioners to discuss the draft CIP prepared by Underwood Engineers, Inc.

Chairman D. Provencher noted that the Capital Improvement Plan (CIP) was prepared by Underwood Engineers, Inc. At this time, Keith Pratt explained that the CIP was done in the same format that MVD has been using for a while and is published in the MVD's Annual Report. He noted that the Planning Board does like get a review on it and Underwood is slightly ahead of the usual schedule, likely due to pressure from the Planning Board. Pratt stated that most of the recommendations are based on the Master Plan and the Asset Management Plan and are informed by the Water Supply Update Study as well as the Cost of Service Study. The Water Supply Update Study will be available in a couple of weeks, if not sooner. Pratt stated that the top tiered projects come from the Water Supply Update Study and noted that the two biggest ones in the CIP are Mitchell Woods and Artificial Recharge at Wells 4&5. Pratt noted that the cost numbers are updated and explained that typically and historically the district has liked to put forth a little bit more planning a year or two ahead of time to make sure the study numbers, which are still somewhat conceptual, are in better shape to be better informed when moving forward with a warrant article. Because of this, you may see a \$50,000 preliminary engineering cost a couple of years prior to the big capital numbers. Pratt stated that the Pennichuck Water Works (PWW) wholesale agreement is another big project on the CIP. Initially Underwood expected to see some capital associated with this, however, there really is not. This is because the ask from PWW is low enough to not require capital project items, and Milford has reportedly looked to take less water than PWW originally thought, making the current infrastructure suitable. Pratt explained that there are other projects that are either ongoing or completed, such as the treatment plants, the SCADA, and the GIS and IT improvements, that are identified on the CIP. Other maintenance items to existing assets are also identified on the CIP. Pratt shared with the Commissioners that mainline water extensions related to PFAS were also included on the CIP. He noted that he believes this will be discussed at a later time during this meeting but stated that Underwood included a place holder in the amount of \$1.5M. If grants are available, it is noted below that there is an amount offset by grant funds.

Chairman D. Provencher noted that Keith Pratt had mentioned providing an addendum on the unit costs of the source alternative evaluation, which outlines the cost per gallon per day. Chair Provencher then noted that the CIP should be considered tentative because it may be subject to change should MVD choose to pursue different source alternatives than what is shown. He used the example that he is unsure if \$7M for Artificial Recharge (AR) is the best use of funds for the additional amount of water that would be gained. Chairman Provencher clarified that this is an evaluation that still needs to be reviewed. It was clarified that this CIP is not locked in stone and can be changed. Commissioner W. von Schoen asked if it needed to be that concrete and suggested calling it a "water production volume increasing measure"

with a dollar value behind it. He also suggested putting possible alternative examples underneath. Pratt agreed that this was a good idea. Commissioner W. von Schoen asked if the timing was a little late for the \$50,000 study (2024) with a 2026 implementation. He asked if the plan was to be much more aggressive with that. Pratt reminded the commissioners that the half million gallons per day that was being sought was a twenty-year number and if PWW falls into place immediately, there is a commitment as well as the new sources. Pratt stated that Underwood needs to go back and see how all the new wells being online will keep MVD whole. He noted that he believes they will. Pratt also stated that discussion around MVD being more aggressive could happen, but he believes there is time. It was noted that MVD has had wells out of service in some capacity for close to the entirety of the last six-years. At this time, Commissioner J. Lyons asked when Well 9 was expected to be online and whether it would affect production. Chairman D. Provencher answered that it was still up in the air depending on what Well 9 is approved for. Peter Pitsas stated that Well 9 was being delayed by the VFDs, which were expected to be delivered in December. According to Pitsas, the treatment plant is scheduled to be online starting December 14, 2022, however, Pitsas did state that the contractor seemed leery about the VFD delivery date.

Chairman D. Provencher asked if the year the new source item comes into play should be shifted. Pratt stated that he still likes that it ties to the Water Supply Master Plan Update that MVD will receive but noted that he can change the wording to “goals” or “targets” and put them in the sequence of recommendations out of the Water Supply Report. This would be PWW first, Mitchell Woods second, and AR third. It was noted that there are a lot of moving parts and Chairman D. Provencher noted that it is important that people understand this CIP is tentative. Pratt stated that he is okay making the CIP more generic for the water supply source but noted that it is currently listed at \$11M and asked for clarification if he should stick to that number or move forward with listing only the most expensive cost. Chairman D. Provencher stated that his only concern was that people may look at the CIP and think MVD will need to raise \$11M in 2025. Commissioner W. von Schoen suggested putting an asterisk to note that some will fall off the radar. Pratt confirmed that he will add a footnote explaining that all of the supply projects may not be needed. Chairman D. Provencher asked Superintendent R. Miner when he is expecting to go to the Planning Board. He answered that he does not yet have a date, but that the Planning Board is looking for the CIP by the end of July.

It was requested that the CIP be cleaned up, and abbreviations be removed for the ease of those not intimate with the ins and outs of MVD.

2. Board of Commissioners to hear a brief overview of the draft Town *Winter Maintenance and Salt Use Policy* from Kyle Fox, Merrimack Public Works Director.

At this time, Chairman D. Provencher introduced Kyle Fox, the Director of the Merrimack Public Works Department (PWD), and Lori Barrett, Operations Manager of the Highway Division of Merrimack PWD. Fox explained that he wanted to meet with the commissioners as stakeholders for the Salt Use Policy, prior to meeting with the Town Council. Fox stated that the Winter Maintenance and Salt Use Policy was last updated in 1984, and this was their first attempt at sharing their proposal with others. Fox and Barrett will be compiling comments from the stakeholders and sharing them with the Town Council along with their proposal. Fox explained that the policy is quite short, at just four pages. The goal was to keep the policy easy to interpret and follow. The winter maintenance procedures are derived from the policy. Kyle Fox reviewed the policy with the commissioners, stating that a large portion of it is influenced by the Merrimack Village District and the water supply in town. Fox explained that the objective of the policy is to find efficient, environmentally responsible and cost-effective ways to provide winter maintenance, snow removal and ice control on the roadways, sidewalks and municipal parking lots of the municipality for the safety and benefit of the Town’s residents, businesses and the general public. He explained that

the objective will be achieved by implementation and execution of the procedures and tasks outlined in the Town of Merrimack’s Winter Maintenance and Salt Use Procedures. Fox went on to state that due to many variables that are inherent in New England weather, each storm and/or weather event may require different effort and/or emphasis on any number of maintenance tasks, which together determine the overall winter maintenance, snow removal or ice control strategy. Fox shared that the Level of Service explains that it is not possible to maintain snow and ice-free roads or sidewalks during a storm. He noted that it is the intention of the Town to utilize its best efforts, within the means available, to provide practical, safe access to homes, businesses and municipal facilities during and after winter storms. It was also noted that it is the Town’s policy to start to conduct snow removal operations upon accumulations of (2) two-inches of snowfall. Removal of snow shall always be by mechanical means when practical before implementing chemical use. Fox stated that this change was implemented due to environmental concerns and has been followed for many years. Staffing for winter storms will be determined by the Operations Manager (Lori Barrett) utilizing available information. Sidewalk clearance is conducted as soon as practical after winter storms. Fox explained that there are only eighteen employees who plow, assuming everyone is in, and eighteen plow routes. The employees continue to plow until the work is done.

Fox noted that that the next important area of the policy for MVD is the section titled, “Low Salt or Salt Free Areas.” The goal was to craft the policy in a way that was easy to understand and adaptable. It states that the Town of Merrimack has established a list of roadways or portions of roadways as “low salt or no salt” areas to assist in protecting drinking water resources. In the event of extreme icing or winter conditions, the Town may, at its discretion, decide it is in the best interest for public safety to salt roadways. Gravel roads will not be treated with salt at any time during winter maintenance. Low salt or no salt areas were outlined as follows:

No Salt Route	Gravel Roads Subdivision Roads within the Wellhead Protection Area
Limited Salt Route	Collector/Arterial Roads within the Wellhead Protection Area Subdivision Roads without Access to Public Water
Salt Route	All Other Roads

No salt routes may be treated with aggregates, abrasives or non-chloride based chemicals.

Limited salt routes may be treated with aggregates, abrasives, non-chloride based chemicals, or chloride based chemicals at an application rate up to 50% of normal application rates.

Salt routes may be treated with aggregates, abrasive, non-chloride based chemicals, or chloride based chemicals per normal application rates.

It was noted that the Town does not currently use non-chloride based chemicals, but the policy is designed to be flexible for the future. Fox directed the commissioners to a table in the procedures that outlined how much salt can be used per mile (dependent upon the temperature and type of precipitation). The trucks are all capable of having the number programed in.

Fox explained the execution, stating that the policy is intended to inform the standard operating procedures for winter maintenance, snow removal and/or ice control for the Town of Merrimack. One or more of the following, which may delay or prevent the implementation of this policy, may affect all or any part of this Policy:

- Equipment Breakdown or availability
- Snow accumulation in excess of 1” per hour
- Extreme weather conditions; freezing rain, icing, low temperatures, windy conditions
- Traffic congestion
- Emergencies
- Personnel illness or employee shortages
- Right-of-way obstructions
- Other events beyond the reasonable control of the Town

Fox reiterated that what they are hoping to get are comments and thoughts that can be presented to the Town Council so they can consider each of the stakeholders’ needs as they finalize the policy.

Commissioner J. Lyons stated that he did not have any questions but the fact that MVD is moving away from Well 3 because of this very issue is telling and something that Fox could present to the Town Council. Chairman D. Provencher explained that the reason MVD pursued Well 9 is because the commissioners did not think it made sense to spend the financial commitment at Well 3 for iron and manganese treatment before treating for PFAS. The investment could have been spent on the treatment for Well 3 rather than Well 9 but Well 3 had elevated levels of sodium and chloride that continued to rise. Chairman Provencher stated that this is what formed the commissioner’s awareness of the severity of the situation and was the reason behind MVD forming the Salt Mitigation Committee. Chairman Provencher noted that some roads that were previously no salt will be moving to low salt due to emergency situations that can occur and the safety level being a priority, especially on main roads. He questioned how much Fox and Barrett thought the application would change from what has previously been happening. Continental Boulevard and Naticook Road were given as examples. Fox answered that a fair statement would be that the level of service previously seen is similar to what you’d continue to see if this policy is approved. The old policy had an escape clause that stated salt could be used if necessary.

Chairman D. Provencher asked how the salt truck driver employees know when they need to switch between limited salt to no salt on their routes. L. Barrett explained that each plow driver is assigned an area and the driver is typically in the same zone each time, unless there is a shortage of employees. The employees work as a team and become very familiar with their area. Employees are provided with maps that are color coded by plow zone and a list of streets by salt use, but the change made to the salt application rates between salt use areas is manual. The training is done every year with a winter kick off meeting before employees are sent out on the road. Chairman Provencher stated that MVD’s initiative to add more signage will work nicely as a visual reminder to the drivers as well.

Jamie Emery, of Emery & Garret, noted that in Dover, NH, the amount of salt used on each route during each storm is measured so there is the ability to determine at the end of the season if less salt had been used than the previous year. He asked if Merrimack had this same capability and if the trucks have GPS to keep track of their routes. He noted to the commissioners that it may make sense to adjust some of the signs to specifically note no/low salt areas. He also asked if there was any input the commissioners could add to the maps that may specifically highlight roads believed to be highly sensitive within the Well Head Protection Area (WHPA) and encourage even less salt if possible. Fox answered that Barrett does keep track of how much salt is used on each road but noted that it is highly variable from year to year due to the type of precipitation. Fox noted that anti-icing rather than de-icing is a key philosophy for the PWD, stating that pre-treating the road to prevent bonding to the pavement uses less salt than de-icing. The way the roads are treated varies highly depending upon the type of precipitation in each storm. Emery asked if Merrimack has pre-brine trucks, to which Barrett answered that Merrimack has the capability to add liquid brine to crystalized salt in all of their trucks. Circling back, Fox answered that

vehicle location is in all of the trucks and it is monitored to be sure that roads are not getting double covered. Fox also explained that after many conversations with Superintendent R. Miner, it is the PWD's intention to piggyback on the grant program and put up all new signs salt/limited salt signs associated with the new policy. Once MVD's new signs are posted the plan is to add no salt / limited salt signs on the same posts.

Chair Provencher asked how Merrimack pretreats for storms. Barrett answered that there are different methods, but it usually just salt on the spreader on the wet pavement. However, Merrimack is trying to reduce salt use by wetting the crystalized salt with liquid brine as a new form of pretreatment. This is done by putting a brine on top of the salt crystals. Merrimack has experimented with a brine trailer but when using only brine there needs to be a specific traffic count for activation and Merrimack does not seem to have that. It is believed that pre-wetting the salt will reduce the salt use.

Commissioner W. von Schoen asked Fox and Barrett how the policy is policed. Barrett answered that there are Foremen on the road to do that, and they are assigned to specific areas.

Chairman D. Provencher stated that parking lots seem to be a large issue, noting that there are large parking lots in no salt areas that are covered in salt during the wintertime, but there is no bylaw preventing that outside of new projects. Fox stated that this was valuable information for the Town Council, but he was unsure if they had the ability to change that. He also noted that PWD has no ability to effect that change.

Chairman D. Provencher offered to email his review comments on the Salt Use Policy & Procedures to Fox, who replied that he would prefer to receive one document from MVD with combined comments.

3. Board of Commissioners to discuss Jamie Emery of Emery & Garret to Update MVD Well 9 Final Report

Jamie Emery informed the commissioners that they had received the comments back from NHDES. They were as expected. The microscopic particulate analysis (MPA) results were zero, meaning low risk for surface water influence. The aerobic spore forming bacteria (ASFB) analysis was also done for the stream and the well. The stream came up with high levels of ASFB, which was expected, and the well came up with zero. The well is not directly influenced by surface water. Emery explained that, as expected, NHDES is concerned about the impacts on Naticook Brook. One year ago, it was demonstrated that Naticook Brook was dry. The argument will be the same, that when the water level is below the Naticook Brook, it does not matter if it is 5, 10, or 15 feet, there is no more water coming out of the brook if the water level declines further below that brook. Emery explained that the big issue is whether it recovers during the year. NHDES has asked that a ground water monitoring program be put in place that will delineate that issue. Emery plans on photographing the Naticook Brook a few more times. Emery stated that the total permitted capacity of Wells 2, 3 and the old Well 1 are roughly 2,600 gallons per minute. The combined pumping rate that is being requested from Wells 9 & 2 is 2,000 gallons per minute. NHDES is arguing that regardless of permitting, MVD only uses 2 – 2.5 million gallons per day and permitting 2,000 gallons per minute would equate to roughly 3M gallons per day. Emery stated that NHDES would likely question what the available amount of recharge is in order to sustain this number of gallons per minute. Emery informed the commissioners that he had Superintendent R. Miner and Business Manager J. Lavoie pull out the records from 1997 and 1998 to look at how much water was being pumped from Wells 1, 2 and 3. The maximum day that he could find during that time frame was roughly 2.1M gallons per day, or roughly 1,500 gallons per minute, combined for the three wells. He explained that in reality, MVD might have to accept a condition that says the Naticook Brook aquifer can only be permitted for 2,000 gallons per minute, with 1,000 gallons per minute for Well 9 and will

monitor usage to demonstrate that it is not having an impact on Naticook Brook in an adverse way. He stated that he believes this can be made to work and was not surprised by the letter.

Emery stated that he believes it was overlooked that Well 3 has always had an impact on Greens Pond, to the point of no overflow. He stated that he will be interested to see if there is more flow when well 3 is off, stating that there will be benefits to not pumping Greens Pond.

Commissioner von Schoen stated that his concern with the letter is that it seems almost as though NHDES is attempting to argue that MVD does not need any additional water, and therefore they do not need to permit any more water. He stated that he felt it is important for NHDES to understand that the average use is not what the pump rates and infrastructure need to be scaled for, but rather the peak rates. Emery expressed agreement with Commissioner von Schoen. He stated that he will be asking Superintendent R. Miner and Business Manager J. Lavoie to look into peak demand from Wells 1, 2 and 3. Chairman D. Provencher stated that he does not want to give up the amount of water that MVD already has permitted. Emery expressed agreement with this statement and shared that they would continue to fight for this permitted amount. Emery said that one possible “worst case scenario” would be that the well is permitted to be used hard during the summer, with an allowance for recovery time in the spring and fall. Chair Provencher stated that he wants NHDES to remember that a DES regulations require that a certain capacity still needs to be reached if the largest well goes out of service for one reason or another.

Chairman Provencher asked Emery if he had seen permits where two wells pull from the same aquifer, but each individual well has an individual day permit of “x” number of gallons, but there is a cap on what the two wells combined are permitted to draw at the same time. Emery stated that he believes NHDES will look at it wholistically and give a permitted amount per day / month / year, but their current focus is Well 9.

In conclusion, Emery is going to propose a well monitoring plan that was asked for. An approval will then be drafted by NHDES, followed by a public hearing.

As a side, Emery expressed that he does not want Well 3 decommissioned, stating that he would like it to be kept for emergencies. Chairman D. Provencher questioned whether Well 3 can even be used for emergencies due to elevated Manganese and PFAS. Peter Pitsas suggested that Well 3 may need to be piped into an existing storage tank to be mixed with other source water before being allowed to be used. Chairman D. Provencher stated that he agreed with Emery about not decommissioning Well 3, but not if it is at the peril of losing permitted capacity at Well 9. Emery agreed.

FINANCE/HUMAN RESOURCES REVIEW – Michele Holton

A. Analysis of Revenue and Expenditures Report

Michele Holton, Finance/H.R. Director, informed the Commission that having completed the month of June, Merrimack Village District (MVD) fiscal year is complete. There are still some expenses coming in in the form of invoices that closed out by June 30, 2022. Open purchase orders are being reviewed to determine which invoices are coming, what needs to be closed out, and what needs to be encumbered and carried over to the next year. With the year complete, the preliminary numbers are showing that revenues were just over \$5 Million, and the expenses were just under \$4 Million, resulting in a net ordinary income of just over \$1 Million. This does include the move of the purchase of PWW water up into the expense line so it is coming out of budget dollars. This was moved to the

regular budget when it was determined that the net ordinary income was ending so strong. This allowed the funds in the non-capital reserve to be left for the continued purchase of water per the PUC agreement. The net ordinary income is \$473,000 above the same time last year. The revenues overall were roughly 12% above budget. With additional expenses pending, the expense account is expected to come in at 90.9% of budget.

Director Holton informed the commissioners that the auditors would like to see MVD put a fund balance policy in place within the next year. There is various input from different agencies and various industry information that will be reviewed and used to help create the policy.

Commissioner W. von Schoen referenced account 60650 (Filtration of PFAS), stating that the year-to-date actual is \$0, but the budget is \$65,000, with a note that reads “4&5 GAC filters lasting longer than anticipated.” He stated that he does not understand that comment. Superintendent R. Miner stated that it was budgeted for a change out. Commissioner W. von Schoen clarified that they did not last longer, but it was decided that they would be run longer in order to collect data. He stated that he just wants to be cautious about what they are saying regarding the filtration media, because it is certainly not lasting longer than anticipated. Director Holton asked for and was provided clarification. Commissioner von Schoen suggested that the wording read along the lines of “4&5 GAC filters used for longer duty cycle for testing purposes.”

B. Bank Account Summary Review

Director Holton noted that Turkey Hill booster account is closing in July 2022, as well as the Penta escrow account. She also shared that the unspent bond proceeds for new well development have been exhausted.

REGULAR SESSION

4. Board of Commissioners to receive an update from Underwood Engineers for ongoing projects to include:

a) Wells 7 & 8

Pitsas informed the commissioners that 7 & 8 is continuing to operate. It was noted at a previous meeting that there was high head loss in vessel number one. Underwood spoke with Evoqua who recommended backwashing the vessel. That was done on June 9, 2022. Once that was done, the headless did go down. However, it did not go down to the original level. Once the backwash was complete operation continued. The head loss has since started to rise again. Evoqua has not responded to a few issues that Underwood presented. On June 9th, multiple water samples were taken, including raw water, water coming out of the greensand, water coming out of the GAC, and multiple samples coming out of the backwash to determine the water quality and to see if there's anything happening. Evoqua was contacted in early July for an update and has yet to respond. Chair Provencher asked if it was to the point of restricting flow. Pitsas answered that it does not restrict flow, but it adds head and requires the speed of the well pumps to be increased. A pressure gauge has been put on each port and found that the head loss was not uniform throughout the whole vessel and was mainly in the top 25%. Pitsas stated that Evoqua has a hint that it may be some sort of chemical getting through the greensand and getting onto the bed. Pitsas stated that the samples from the backwash all looked clear to the eye, but that does not mean it is clear. Chairman Provencher asked who was collecting the

samples. Pitsas answered that it was Evoqua sampling. Chairman Provencher stated that in the future it would be good to have duplicate samples taken for MVD to have. Chairman Provencher asked if the extra pressure going through the greensand creates any issue with the greensand vessel. Pitsas answered that it does not. Commissioner W. von Schoen stated that at the last meeting putting a marker on the data tables and charts signifying when the vessel was backwashed so it is remembered if anything has changed. This will record the dates of the backwash or any time the GAC has been jumbled. Pitsas stated that he will pass this request on to Billy to add this line.

Pitsas stated that on the Wells 4 & 5 project, Evoqua's O&M manual said to backwash the vessel if there is high head loss. However, on the Wells 7 & 8 project it says if there is high head loss, to backwash the vessel but the warranty is void if this is done more than a specific number of times. When the Well 2 project came out, this became even stricter.

Pitsas informed the commissioners that there was a slight technical problem as the pressure went up, requiring the well pumps to run at a higher pressure. He stated that the chem feed pumps that were designed to pump in the caustic were a 60 psi pump, but as they approached the mid-50s Bryan noticed that they were unable to keep up. The pumps were then changed out to a higher capacity pump. He noted that Bryan was beginning to worry that he would not be able to adjust the pH levels properly because of the higher pressure. Taking a core sample was discussed, but it would require getting to the top of the tank and opening the hatch.

b) Wells 2 & 3 (9)/BOC to authorize signing of Eversource Easement Deed

Pitsas informed the commissioners that the work has been steady at Wells 2 & 9. The longer lead items are the butterfly valves, which are all on site aside from the class 250 valves. Those are being used on the existing Well 2 building and the inlet piping to the vessels. This is because of the higher pressure rated valves in case MVD moves to a polishing treatment system after the greensand. Those are due to be shipped in mid-September. The generator is scheduled to be shipped mid-August. The VFD for Well 2 is expected mid-August and the VFD for Well 9 is expected mid-December. The contractor has noted a substantial completion date of December 16, 2022. The existing Well 2 building is scheduled to be shut down on August 29th to start doing work. Underwood wants to continue to monitor the precipitation and usage that the system is consuming to see if the date needs to be modified. Once the Well is taken offline the RTU panel will be pulled off and the facility will not be up and running until the new VFD and well pump are in.

At this time, Superintendent R. Miner explained that Eversource is asking for the easement deed. Commissioner W. von Schoen asked if it was normal for an easement to exclude wording of consideration for the property owner, in the sense that Eversource can access without notification as long as everything is put back when finished. Superintendent R. Miner stated that he was unsure and would look into it. Commissioner W. von Schoen suggested running the easement past the lawyers before moving forward. Pitsas stated that this easement requires a vote to be finalized. He noted that the contractor was looking for this and asked if the commissioners would feel comfortable conditionally approving the easement. Commissioner W. von Schoen stated that he would appreciate a certain amount of courtesy and it would not hurt to have it in writing. Superintendent R.

Miner stated that he could run it through legal and asked if as long as they are fine with it, it could move forward. The board members expressed agreement. Commissioner W. von Schoen requested an update prior to the August meeting.

**MOTION BY COMMISSIONER W. VON SCHOEN TO APPROVE THE
EVERSOURCE EASEMENT, SUBJECT TO APPROVAL BY LEGAL COUNSEL
MOTION SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER K. AYERS**

**MOTION CARRIED
4-0-0**

5. Board of Commissioners to hear updated on possible grant from NHDES to extend mainlines to private well areas affected by PFAS

Superintendent R. Miner stated that there was not a lot of new information on this topic. He informed the commissioners that MVD has been in contact with Amy Rousseau at NHDES and has updated the distribution maps to reflect mainlines that were not on there. A map was sent back to MVD highlighting areas that have private well PFAS exceedances. Superintendent R. Miner also noted a conversation he had with Chairman D. Provencher about utilizing less engineering, but after speaking with K. Pratt, he learned that there was not a need for the same level of involvement as the pump house for Wells 4 & 5.

Chairman D. Provencher asked if Superintendent R. Miner confirmed with NHDES that multiple grants could be accessed by having the Town of Merrimack also apply for a grant. Superintendent R. Miner stated that a conversation with A. Rousseau made it sound as though the town option was not available, but MVD could apply for multiple grants. P. Pitsas clarified that if multiple grants are given, the total funds are not cumulative, they will need to be divided by project. If two grants in the amount of \$1.5M each were given, they would need to be for separate projects. If one of the projects were to cost \$2M, MVD would be responsible for the remaining half million dollars and could not apply funds from the second grant.

6. Board of Commissioners to review the minutes from the June 20, 2022 regular BOC meeting.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Board of Commissioners Regular Meeting June 20,
2022

No amendments were offered.

**MOTION BY COMMISSIONER W. VON SCHOEN TO ACCEPT THE MEETING MINUTES
OF THE JUNE 20, 2022 BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS REGULAR MEETING AS
PRESENTED
MOTION SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER J. LYONS**

MOTION CARRIED

4-0-0

7. Board of Commissioners to review Action Items from previous meetings and items to be added from this meeting.

The Commissioners reviewed the list of Action Items, removing tasks that have been completed, and making necessary additions. Of this numbered list, Superintendent R. Miner addressed number 60, stating that he had contacted Lou Niles regarding Zeolite, and Niles reported that it is NSF approved. No documentation was provided, but Superintendent R. Miner will request.

8. Old Business

At this time, Chairman D. Provencher asked about the First Amendment to the Agreement with the John Flatley Company (Flatley) that was provided to the commissioners in the board packet. Superintendent R. Miner explained that these were changes made on behalf of himself. He noted that he believes it should be an amendment to the original agreement to avoid confusion. Superintendent R. Miner asked if the board had any amendments to add. Chairman Provencher stated that he had not had a chance to adequately review it. It was noted that it will be sent to Legal prior to being returned to Flatley.

9. New Business - none

10. Superintendent's Report

Superintendent R. Miner informed the commissioners that MVD is still waiting on the information about PFPrA from Brandon Kernen of NHDES. Business Manager J. Lavoie has reached out.

Superintendent R. Miner made the commissioners aware that the following Wednesday there would be tours of the treatment plants for the interns working for the Town of Merrimack as well as the interns at PWW.

The commissioners were informed that an email was sent to them making them aware that Merrimack is in a moderate drought. The monitoring wells are still looking good.

11. Questions from the Public/Press

None

ADJOURNMENT

MOTION BY COMMISSIONER J. LYONS TO ADJOURN

MOTION SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER K. AYERS

MOTION CARRIED

4-0-0

The July 18, 2022 meeting of the Board of Commissioners was adjourned at 7:56 p.m.

Submitted by Amanda McKenna, Recording Secretary